

THE LIBERATOR:

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY,

AT THE ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, NO. 25 COSSHILL.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, General Agent:

To whom all remittances are to be made, and
all correspondence addressed, relating to the pecuniary con-
cerns of the paper.

LETTER FEES—\$2.50 per annum, payable in ad-
vance, or \$5.00 at the expiration of six months.Extra copies will be sent to one address for ten
cents; to two or more, for fifteen cents.

Letters and communications must be POST PAID.

ADVERTISEMENTS missing less than a square
inch, well inserted three times for 75 cts.; one square
inch, well inserted three times for 75 cts.; one square
inch, well inserted three times for 75 cts.

Financial Committee.

JOHN JACKSON, SAMUEL PHILbrick,
WILLIAM GRAY LORING, EDMUND QUINCY,
WILLIAM BASSETT.

M. L. LLOYD GARRISON, Editor.

AMUEL SELLERS, Jr.

E. M. S.

CUTS.—The Upper

part of this page
was cut out of the

New-York Courier and Enquirer.

Mr. Dewey's Lecture on American Morals

and Manners.

The lecture at the Tabernacle last evening, before

the N.Y. Lyceum, on American Morals and

Manners, was one of the most judicious, convincing

and practical discourses we have ever heard. In

reference to the morals of America, he spoke first

of the general and subsequent. His main argument

was, that no person, who had

seen it, could possibly conceive of the state of

feeling on this subject in Europe. During

any time, he said, without a single exception,

any with whom he had held any intercourse,

any to him of the matter; and the almost

unanimous belief seemed to be, that all

the slaves in the United States and repudiated their duties, and that the

national character of America had sunk into

dissidence.

The cause was, he said, through

the old world, a feeling of intense indignation,

a decided aversion to the South,

and a strong desire to be freed from

the yoke of slavery.

Prussia.—A letter from

Col. [unclear], fought a duel with

him, was wounded, and

condemned. The King has

been accordingly

expelled from Elben Fuerst,

and the other two persons

to be sentenced to five years

in prison.

The Green Mountain Boys

President of the Finance

Committee up for some time,

and the extension of the

Albion thousand dollars

in prosecution to the com-

to be held in many other

states.

At a Point a Pines, a

by the lesser branch, also

No, no, said a handsome

young fellow for the boy

records a noble sentiment

500 for an outfit in his

suit.

A full of a shower of rain

alarm to provide it

with a head postman

he would be weak

—head being to move

Post relates a terrible case

The reporter says that

the case of the poor

the sum of \$50,000 of the

the thousand dollars were

the eyes of their opponents.

[The laughter was

now as loud and universal as had been the applause

before their debts ever been made.

He would be glad to see all

most powerful pens in the world engaged in a

a courageous effort to arouse the public conscience

a cause of the crisis that has come upon our country

and its institutions. He wished the master, how

ever, to be treated in a grave and candid manner,

it was in which wisdom should take pre-

eminence.

The reporter said, that he had no

that in the Union would repudiate

the South.

He thought, however, that justice to their

and to their own reputation, demanded an

and solemn avowal of their indebtedness;

and, as soon as possible, to pay. If

Legislatures of any of the States were afraid to do so, he believed that, like base demagogues

they did not know the people whose fate

they sought to gain. He said it had been stated

he said, if he were a citizen of that State,

would breathe its air no longer than was necessary

able him to make his escape.

Dr. Dewey spoke at some length of other topics,

the influence of the terrible commercial distress to

which this country had been subjected, the true

character of the lynch law of which so much is said

as being merely a border evil, constantly re-

ceding before the progress of civilization,—and of

the personal habits actually prevalent in good so-

ciety. Whatever foreigners may say, he had, in

the course of an extended intercourse with the peo-

ple, never seen a person split upon a carpet or a par-

floor in his life. And yet, to judge from the

statements of foreign tourists, one would think we

kept bears in our parlors, bowie-knives on our dress-

ing tables, and that we varied domestic conversation

by fistfights at the fireside! He closed by drawing

a fine picture of the real difference between the con-

dition of the hopeless, obsequious laboring man in

Europe, the dependent upon some great land-owner in

whose presence he felt scarcely human, and that

he had, the right to form and express such opini-

ons on this, and on all other subjects, as they

used—the right to form Abolition Societies, and

to discuss this subject in any way they chose. But

he said he believed these societies had done infinite

good to the cause they were intended to aid; that

they had alarmed and irritated, instead of convinced

the South; that they had prevented the progress of

traitors and demagogues.

The firemen of the slave

established with a howling

Anderson, a handless

man not expected

to live.

THIS!

had several days

department of a well

kindred employer to

but would avail

nothing. It was pro-

tected to characterize, al-

so the slaves.

Annawan, from New

Louis, was lying to a

tree a few feet across

status?

the Newark Post

and the Weehawken Post

for \$25,000 unpub-

lished. If so, we pre-

dicted to objects con-

siderate.

umor is in town that a

Welland Canal, on

Canal and Canals,

even of the rosters,

and order restored with

the cold months of

September.

TORS,

ODY-WARMING

ENTS.

In Respirators, the

Dr. H. B. Brown

street, at Theodore

Allen's, 228

north of Bedford-street,

for all persons have

coaching-travels

reverent the arrival of

the winter.

It is invaluable to

the cold months of

September.

LIBERATOR.—John

Hartford—John

Munroe, Canterbury

—Thomas H.

Andrews' Bridge

—James C. Fuller, New

Waterloo; John

Bardley, Rutherford;

—Abner G. Knobell,

Wellington—John

Cortisville—A. Bro-

well, Allegany—John

Green—John

Hartford—John

Postmaster may en-

trust a newspaper to a

person, and frank

them should always be

credited.

Postmaster may en-

trust a newspaper to a

person, and frank

them should always be

credited.

Postmaster may en-

trust a newspaper to a

person, and frank

them should always be

credited.

Postmaster may en-

trust a newspaper to a

person, and frank

them should always be

credited.

Postmaster may en-

trust a newspaper to a

person, and frank

them should always be

credited.

Postmaster may en-

trust a newspaper to a

person, and frank

them should always be

SELECTIONS.

From the Herald of Freedom.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS SOCIETY.

dressed the people of Oberlin. They were mostly of that class who are called the Liberty party. In the course of his remarks, he endeavored to convince them that a separate political organization, for the sole purpose of maintaining the constitutional rights of the people of the free States in regard to slavery, was necessary. It was one of the objections of these men that southern slaveholders would never be induced to support the Constitution in the spirit in which it was adopted. On this point (Mr. G. said) he endeavored to persuade them that they were in error; that southern men will love the Constitution, and who were sworn to support it, would turn their attention to those rights, and would meet us on the line of the Constitution, and would unite with northern men in the maintenance of all the rights of all the States. He remarked that he quoted in support of southern slaveholders, whom he respected, and who had shown themselves willing to do so. North upon the true constitutional line. He said he then stated that he would read a letter from a southern man, and a slaveholder, in which his own sentiments were set forth in full. He then read the letter; and, on a call for the name, he announced it to be Mr. Clay. He then went on to say that it was C. M. Clay, one of the wealthiest, and most pure, and most influential men in Kentucky. Mr. G. said he went on to say that he had no authority to say that Henry Clay would thus support the Constitution; but that, from his acknowledged patriotism, and devotion to his country, he had no doubt that he would support the constitutional rights of the North as firmly as he would those of the South.

Mr. G. said he was informed that an editor was present who had, a few days previously, published a vile falsehood, saying that he (Mr. G.) had been expelled from Congress for presenting resolutions to dissolve the Union; and he then called public attention to this libel and slander. This editor had seen fit to publish the misrepresentation to which his colleague had referred, which was an unmitigated falsehood.

Mr. Duncum inquired whether his colleague had stated in the meeting that the letter was from Cassius M. Clay, and whether his colleague had ever contradicted the report in writing.

Mr. Giddings replied that he had stated to the meeting that it was from Cassius M. Clay, and that he expressly said that Henry Clay had never been called by any of these names; that when he first saw the report, taken from the Richmond Enquirer, he had written instantly to the editor, stating these facts; and this letter had been published in that paper, and to this; and if his colleague had not seen it, the fault lay not on himself.

Mr. A. V. Brown observed, he was a little afraid that the indulgence he had extended to the gentleman from Ohio had resulted as any indulgence to abolition petitions would. The gentleman had asked for only two minutes, and had taken five; and he was afraid that, when they yielded to these abolitionists what they now so strenuously contended for—the right of petition—they would not be content to stop there, but would go on asking for more and more indulgences, until they succeeded in accomplishing their objects.

His object in addressing the House now was, not to affect abroad, but to have some effect in the House, and contribute, if possible, something towards the settlement of this delicate and perplexing question. He was in favor of committing this report; not because it did not contain the 21st rule, but because it contained no rule at all to govern their proceedings on abolition petitions. There was a time when there was no rule on this subject; but what time was it? It was when the full spirit of fanaticism had never invaded this hall; but it had begun to infest the land, these petitions came in in such numbers, that, with the size of that body, there were not members enough to act them off, so that the petitions desisted. There was, therefore, a necessity for some rule to govern their action on them, though some gentlemen told them that they could do without rules; that two hundred and twenty men, having to act every day on the important business of the country, could, at the same time, act consistently and understandingly on these petitions, without any rule at all. In former times, the House disposed of this subject by resolutions. They had the Patten resolution, the Pinckney resolution, and the Atherton resolutions; and, finally, they adopted the 21st rule. At that time they were told by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams,) by John C. Clark, by Seth M. Gates, and other abolitionists on the floor, why they proclaimed external opposition to that rule; not because they favored or opposed the objects they had in view, but because, as they contended, it was an abridgment of the great right of petition. What did they now hear? What did they hear from those they called their friends? men who would go with them in sustaining the great compromises of the Constitution; who loved that instrument, and were ready to stand or fall by it—

The Speaker here informed the gentleman that the morning hour had expired.

Mr. Saunders moved to suspend the rules, to allow Mr. Brown to go on with his remarks. He wished this debate to be brought to a close.

Mr. J. C. Ingalls then called for tellers; but the call was not sustained.

On taking the question, the ayes were 23, nays 61. So the rules were not suspended, there not being a majority of two-thirds.

Correspondence of the Journal of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, Saturday, Jan. 6th.

The House to-day resumed the discussion of the Report of the Rules. Every thing went off calmly and quietly, showing that some things can be discussed as well as others, and that the horror of touching the slavery question has been overcome.

We have a new set of men, mostly young men, who are free from bigotry and prejudice. I hope much from this House yet. Mr. Adams, with his characteristic sneer, said, the other day—"I do not know that I shall be much gratified by the eloquence, or instructed by the wisdom of this House." If I am not mistaken, he has been a little of both in the speeches of Stevens, Clingman, Beardsey and others. The old gentleman has given the most unequivocal signs of gratification at those speeches, to say nothing of those of Davis and Duncan, to which he gave the strictest attention. If there is a man in this nation who has come to be gratified at the indications shewn by this House, it is Mr. Adams. The utmost courtesy has been extended to him, so far as goes. The Speaker put him in the place where he most wished to be—in opposition to the wishes of the whole South.—Chairman of the Committee on Rules. In that Committee, he had every advantage that he could possibly desire—and found, greatly to his surprise—the greatest victory ever achieved in legislation, in this country—a victory that would alone, blotting out all his previous history, carry his name to posterity. He was defeated, after a ten years struggle, all legislative restrictions on the right of petition, and opened the whole subject of slavery to free and calm discussion, in the House of Representatives. Mr. Adams's whole course at this session, has been a procession of triumph.

The Session adjourned. In the House, the subject of the Report on Rules was taken up. Mr. Duncan, of Ohio, spoke at length on the subject, and in a manner that arrested much attention. He came out in opposition to the restriction on the reception and discussion of slavery petitions, but still opposed modern abolition, and pointed out very clearly the ill effects that would result from the emancipation of three millions of slaves.

Mr. Brown, of Tennessee, followed on the other side, but, after the expiration of the morning hour, was obliged to give way to the order of the day.

SLAVE TRADE IN CUBA. A correspondent from the New-York Journal of Commerce, writing from Havana, Dec. 15, gives the following deplorable account of the slave traffic:

"There is no hope, at present, that the slave trade will cease. New arrivals continue, and more are expected. I thought the 'New Sultan' possessed more humanity; but I am convinced he cannot forget coming from 'Old Spain,' and that the policy of that nation is to live upon the groans of victims, allowing them to capture and traffic in these unhappy Africans."

Every day are these unhappy beings, as by enchantment, offered at public sale in this city, without regard to law, and as if there were no authorities to execute it. On the contrary, the agent commission to collect the half dozen per head, is well-known, and undisguised. My wishes are to make known to the world these transactions, and brand all implicated with the most ignominious and public disgrace."

SELECTIONS.

From the Herald of Freedom.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS SOCIETY.

It is again at hand, and one cannot help, as it approaches, feeling a revival of the ancient anti-slavery spirit. Except our national grants and admiring anniversary, and perhaps the N. England yearly Convention, no anti-slavery meeting in the land can compare with it for bold, heart-stirring interest. It is held at Anti-Slavery's native place. The mover of the Anti-Slavery enterprise still lives and is there, to urge it on with the same lofty fidelity, and the same intrepidity of spirit, that first dared disclose its forlorn-hope banner to the storm. The scared and tempest-beaten veterans, that have toiled about that banner and helped keep it afloat on the storm it was born in, and that has tossed it ever since, will meet there to greet their loved pioneer and another, around its staff. Let its old, rent, and weather-soldiers flutter once more over their heads. They have grown old before their time, under its dozen years' streaming. I hope to meet them all there. The tried and proven souls of the city—the worthies for being born in a city. The marshals of the Massachusetts field, weary and honor-laden from their western service of a hundred pitched battles—the men of Connecticut—not of 'Tevidale,' but Pleasant Height; and they of Rhode Island—every one a host, in himself, and (herself), independent of the influence of array or band—always in line, self-moved—and the survivors of our New-Hampshire battle. They say in Congress our little delegation can always be implicitly relied on to go for slavery. (They must make exception now.) Will they not say, on the anti-slavery platform, our scanty phalanx can, of course, be counted on for liberty? They can, and they do. And they will be down to Boston from Maine, unfurled and stately in their magnificence, bearing over them Vermont, too. And their moral spirits, as well as clashing politician orators, within her green borders. They must descend on the Yankee city. But I should not speak of States. Anti-Slavery knows nothing of them. She sees nothing of their lines, as with free foot she traverses the land. She despises no State line, or any other, save the moral Mason and Dixon's, that traverse between her and her adversary. All on her own side of that, is common ground to her, and the paltry strata, at which geography and politics stumble, as at mounds and mill logs, she walks over undiscovered and unapproached.

The country is all astir with Anti-Slavery. Abolitionists have but little to do, save give it moral direction and save the enterprise from lapsing and degenerating into miserable politics. The priesthood are striving to divert it from their strong-holds, and turn it off upon the ballot-box, with all the assiduity of an old hen-partridge fluttering to divert a sportsman away from her nest of young ones. Let Anti-Slavery keep her eye staunch upon the church and clergy, and all the subordinate moral (or immoral) influences of the land. And let her not falter to assault oars and institutions, as well as their incidents, wherever they are intrinsically the bulwarks and pillars of the system she is at war with. Let the police and the army and the navy be regarded as objects of reform, rather than instrumentalities. Anti-Slavery must beware of their interfering, officious aid. A third party! I would as soon drum recruits for a third military establishment—or a naval—third (or second) army or navy, to crusade against the most powerful nation in the country. They will get no countenance at the anniversary of the Pioneer. I hope they will hold every meeting in Old Faneuil Hall—partly because it can be had to meet the most of them; but it had begun to infest the land, these petitions came in in such numbers, that, with the size of that body, there were not members enough to act them off, so that the petitions desisted. There was, therefore, a necessity for some rule to govern their action on them, though some gentlemen told them that they could do without rules; that two hundred and twenty men, having to act every day on the important business of the country, could, at the same time, act consistently and understandingly on these petitions, without any rule at all. In former times, the House disposed of this subject by resolutions. They had the Patten resolution, the Pinckney resolution, and the Atherton resolutions; and, finally, they adopted the 21st rule. At that time they were told by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams,) by John C. Clark, by Seth M. Gates, and other abolitionists on the floor, why they proclaimed external opposition to that rule; not because they favored or opposed the objects they had in view, but because, as they contended, it was an abridgment of the great right of petition. What did they now hear? What did they hear from those they called their friends? men who would go with them in sustaining the great compromises of the Constitution; who loved that instrument, and were ready to stand or fall by it—

Mr. Giddings replied that he had stated to the meeting that it was from Cassius M. Clay, and that he expressly said that Henry Clay had never been called by any of these names; that when he first saw the report, taken from the Richmond Enquirer, he had written instantly to the editor, stating these facts; and this letter had been published in that paper, and to this; and if his colleague had not seen it, the fault lay not on himself.

Mr. A. V. Brown observed, he was a little afraid that the indulgence he had extended to the gentleman from Ohio had resulted as any indulgence to abolition petitions would. The gentleman had asked for only two minutes, and had taken five; and he was afraid that, when they yielded to these abolitionists what they now so strenuously contended for—the right of petition—they would not be content to stop there, but would go on asking for more and more indulgences, until they succeeded in accomplishing their objects.

His object in addressing the House now was, not to affect abroad, but to have some effect in the House, and contribute, if possible, something towards the settlement of this delicate and perplexing question. He was in favor of committing this report; not because it did not contain the 21st rule, but because it contained no rule at all to govern their proceedings on abolition petitions. There was a time when there was no rule on this subject; but what time was it? It was when the full spirit of fanaticism had never invaded this hall; but it had begun to infest the land, these petitions came in in such numbers, that, with the size of that body, there were not members enough to act them off, so that the petitions desisted. There was, therefore, a necessity for some rule to govern their action on them, though some gentlemen told them that they could do without rules; that two hundred and twenty men, having to act every day on the important business of the country, could, at the same time, act consistently and understandingly on these petitions, without any rule at all. In former times, the House disposed of this subject by resolutions. They had the Patten resolution, the Pinckney resolution, and the Atherton resolutions; and, finally, they adopted the 21st rule. At that time they were told by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams,) by John C. Clark, by Seth M. Gates, and other abolitionists on the floor, why they proclaimed external opposition to that rule; not because they favored or opposed the objects they had in view, but because, as they contended, it was an abridgment of the great right of petition. What did they now hear? What did they hear from those they called their friends? men who would go with them in sustaining the great compromises of the Constitution; who loved that instrument, and were ready to stand or fall by it—

Mr. Giddings replied that he had stated to the meeting that it was from Cassius M. Clay, and that he expressly said that Henry Clay had never been called by any of these names; that when he first saw the report, taken from the Richmond Enquirer, he had written instantly to the editor, stating these facts; and this letter had been published in that paper, and to this; and if his colleague had not seen it, the fault lay not on himself.

Mr. A. V. Brown observed, he was a little afraid that the indulgence he had extended to the gentleman from Ohio had resulted as any indulgence to abolition petitions would. The gentleman had asked for only two minutes, and had taken five; and he was afraid that, when they yielded to these abolitionists what they now so strenuously contended for—the right of petition—they would not be content to stop there, but would go on asking for more and more indulgences, until they succeeded in accomplishing their objects.

His object in addressing the House now was, not to affect abroad, but to have some effect in the House, and contribute, if possible, something towards the settlement of this delicate and perplexing question. He was in favor of committing this report; not because it did not contain the 21st rule, but because it contained no rule at all to govern their proceedings on abolition petitions. There was a time when there was no rule on this subject; but what time was it? It was when the full spirit of fanaticism had never invaded this hall; but it had begun to infest the land, these petitions came in in such numbers, that, with the size of that body, there were not members enough to act them off, so that the petitions desisted. There was, therefore, a necessity for some rule to govern their action on them, though some gentlemen told them that they could do without rules; that two hundred and twenty men, having to act every day on the important business of the country, could, at the same time, act consistently and understandingly on these petitions, without any rule at all. In former times, the House disposed of this subject by resolutions. They had the Patten resolution, the Pinckney resolution, and the Atherton resolutions; and, finally, they adopted the 21st rule. At that time they were told by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams,) by John C. Clark, by Seth M. Gates, and other abolitionists on the floor, why they proclaimed external opposition to that rule; not because they favored or opposed the objects they had in view, but because, as they contended, it was an abridgment of the great right of petition. What did they now hear? What did they hear from those they called their friends? men who would go with them in sustaining the great compromises of the Constitution; who loved that instrument, and were ready to stand or fall by it—

Mr. Giddings replied that he had stated to the meeting that it was from Cassius M. Clay, and that he expressly said that Henry Clay had never been called by any of these names; that when he first saw the report, taken from the Richmond Enquirer, he had written instantly to the editor, stating these facts; and this letter had been published in that paper, and to this; and if his colleague had not seen it, the fault lay not on himself.

Mr. A. V. Brown observed, he was a little afraid that the indulgence he had extended to the gentleman from Ohio had resulted as any indulgence to abolition petitions would. The gentleman had asked for only two minutes, and had taken five; and he was afraid that, when they yielded to these abolitionists what they now so strenuously contended for—the right of petition—they would not be content to stop there, but would go on asking for more and more indulgences, until they succeeded in accomplishing their objects.

His object in addressing the House now was, not to affect abroad, but to have some effect in the House, and contribute, if possible, something towards the settlement of this delicate and perplexing question. He was in favor of committing this report; not because it did not contain the 21st rule, but because it contained no rule at all to govern their proceedings on abolition petitions. There was a time when there was no rule on this subject; but what time was it? It was when the full spirit of fanaticism had never invaded this hall; but it had begun to infest the land, these petitions came in in such numbers, that, with the size of that body, there were not members enough to act them off, so that the petitions desisted. There was, therefore, a necessity for some rule to govern their action on them, though some gentlemen told them that they could do without rules; that two hundred and twenty men, having to act every day on the important business of the country, could, at the same time, act consistently and understandingly on these petitions, without any rule at all. In former times, the House disposed of this subject by resolutions. They had the Patten resolution, the Pinckney resolution, and the Atherton resolutions; and, finally, they adopted the 21st rule. At that time they were told by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams,) by John C. Clark, by Seth M. Gates, and other abolitionists on the floor, why they proclaimed external opposition to that rule; not because they favored or opposed the objects they had in view, but because, as they contended, it was an abridgment of the great right of petition. What did they now hear? What did they hear from those they called their friends? men who would go with them in sustaining the great compromises of the Constitution; who loved that instrument, and were ready to stand or fall by it—

Mr. Giddings replied that he had stated to the meeting that it was from Cassius M. Clay, and that he expressly said that Henry Clay had never been called by any of these names; that when he first saw the report, taken from the Richmond Enquirer, he had written instantly to the editor, stating these facts; and this letter had been published in that paper, and to this; and if his colleague had not seen it, the fault lay not on himself.

Mr. A. V. Brown observed, he was a little afraid that the indulgence he had extended to the gentleman from Ohio had resulted as any indulgence to abolition petitions would. The gentleman had asked for only two minutes, and had taken five; and he was afraid that, when they yielded to these abolitionists what they now so strenuously contended for—the right of petition—they would not be content to stop there, but would go on asking for more and more indulgences, until they succeeded in accomplishing their objects.

His object in addressing the House now was, not to affect abroad, but to have some effect in the House, and contribute, if possible, something towards the settlement of this delicate and perplexing question. He was in favor of committing this report; not because it did not contain the 21st rule, but because it contained no rule at all to govern their proceedings on abolition petitions. There was a time when there was no rule on this subject; but what time was it? It was when the full spirit of fanaticism had never invaded this hall; but it had begun to infest the land, these petitions came in in such numbers, that, with the size of that body, there were not members enough to act them off, so that the petitions desisted. There was, therefore, a necessity for some rule to govern their action on them, though some gentlemen told them that they could do without rules; that two hundred and twenty men, having to act every day on the important business of the country, could, at the same time, act consistently and understandingly on these petitions, without any rule at all. In former times, the House disposed of this subject by resolutions. They had the Patten resolution, the Pinckney resolution, and the Atherton resolutions; and, finally, they adopted the 21st rule. At that time they were told by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams,) by John C. Clark, by Seth M. Gates, and other abolitionists on the floor, why they proclaimed external opposition to that rule; not because they favored or opposed the objects they had in view, but because, as they contended, it was an abridgment of the great right of petition. What did they now hear? What did they hear from those they called their friends? men who would go with them in sustaining the great compromises of the Constitution; who loved that instrument, and were ready to stand or fall by it—

Mr. Giddings replied that he had stated to the meeting that it was from Cassius M. Clay, and that he expressly said that Henry Clay had never been called by any of these names; that when he first saw the report, taken from the Richmond Enquirer, he had written instantly to the editor, stating these facts; and this letter had been published in that paper, and to this; and if his colleague had not seen it, the fault lay not on himself.

Mr. A. V. Brown observed, he was a little afraid that the indulgence he had extended to the gentleman from Ohio had resulted as any indulgence to abolition petitions would. The gentleman had asked for only two minutes, and had taken five; and he was afraid that, when they yielded to these abolitionists what they now so strenuously contended for—the right of petition—they would not be content to stop there, but would go on asking for more and more indulgences, until they succeeded in accomplishing their objects.

His object in addressing the House now was, not to affect abroad, but to have some effect in the House, and contribute, if possible, something towards the settlement of this delicate and perplexing question. He was in favor of committing this report; not because it did not contain the 21st rule, but because it contained no rule at all to govern their proceedings on abolition petitions. There was a time when there was no rule on this subject; but what time was it? It was when the full spirit of fanaticism had never invaded this hall; but it had begun to infest the land, these petitions came in in such numbers, that, with the size of that body, there were not members enough to act them off, so that the petitions desisted. There was, therefore, a necessity for some rule to govern their action on them, though some gentlemen told them that they could do without rules; that two hundred and twenty men, having to act every day on the important business of the country, could, at the same time, act consistently and understandingly on these petitions, without any rule at all. In former times, the House disposed of this subject by resolutions. They had the Patten resolution, the Pinckney resolution, and the Atherton resolutions; and, finally, they adopted the 21st rule. At that time they were told by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams,) by John C. Clark, by Seth M. Gates, and other abolitionists on the floor, why they proclaimed external opposition to that rule; not because they favored or opposed the objects they had in view, but because, as they contended, it was an abridgment of the great right of petition. What did they now hear? What did they hear from those they called their friends? men who would go with them in sustaining the great compromises of the Constitution; who loved that instrument, and were ready to stand or fall by it—

Mr. Giddings replied that he had stated to the meeting that it was from Cassius M. Clay, and that he expressly said that Henry Clay had never been called by any of these names; that when he first saw the report, taken from the Richmond Enquirer, he had written instantly to the editor, stating these facts; and this letter had been published in that paper, and to this; and if his colleague had not seen it, the fault lay not on himself.

Mr. A. V. Brown observed, he was a little afraid that the indulgence he had extended to the gentleman from Ohio had resulted as any indulgence to abolition petitions would. The gentleman had asked for only two minutes, and had taken five; and he was afraid that, when they yielded to these abolitionists what they now so strenuously contended for—the right of petition—they would not be content to stop there, but would go on asking for more and more indulgences, until they succeeded in accomplishing their objects.

His object in addressing the House now was, not to affect abroad, but

THE LIBERATOR

BOSTON:
THURSDAY MORNING, JANUARY 19, 1844.

ANNUAL Meeting.

Eleventh annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society will convene at FANEUIL HALL, Boston, morning next, 24th instant.

On the evening previous, a lecture will be delivered by CHARLES BURKE, of Philadelphia—place designated in the daily papers.

[FROM THE EDITOR.]

NEW IPSWICH, (N. H.) Jan. 15, 1844.

Friend,

United States, that directed anti-slavery petition to the Legislature, in the Latin letter petition, for the abolition of slavery, which failed of passage, has been anticipated, or was it not, by the tyrannical feeling of those in Washington, the public petition being denied, in the hope of the close of the session, and that, too, by force, in the respects of the slaves, and that, too, by force, may be sustained in such a tyrannical system of devotion and energy, shall loiter in the one, let her never tire, in freedom, blist freedom, be yours for the slave.

MARY P. KENNY.

Petitions.

United States, that directed anti-slavery petition to the Legislature, in the Latin letter petition, for the abolition of slavery, which failed of passage, has been anticipated, or was it not, by the tyrannical feeling of those in Washington, the public petition being denied, in the hope of the close of the session, and that, too, by force, may be sustained in such a tyrannical system of devotion and energy, shall loiter in the one, let her never tire, in freedom, blist freedom, be yours for the slave.

</div

POETRY.

A CALL TO THE PEOPLE.

BY JOHN CUTCHLEY PRINCE.

Awake! the patriot post erie—
Awake! each sire and son!
From long degrading sleep arise,
Ere ruin be begun.
The very echo of your name,
The very shadow of your fame,
Hath many a battle won;
And can ye stoop to what ye are?—
Chained followers of Oppression's car?
Have ye not lashed health and life,
At mad Ambition's call?
Have ye not borne the brunt of strife,
Unbroken as a wall?
Have ye not bled for worthless things,
Priests, placemen, concubines and kings?
Have ye not toiled for all?
And can ye, this sterner hour,
Still slumber in the grasp of power?
Awake! but not to spend your breath
In unavailing ire:
Awake! but not to deal in death;
Crime, carnage, blood and fire:
Awake! but not to hurl the brand
Of desolation round the land;
Till all your hopes expire:
Last vengeance rise amid the gloom,
To push ye to a deeper doom.

In pity to yourselves, beware
Of battle-breathing knaves,
Who raise their voices in the air
To congregated slaves:
Those men who, Judas-like, betray,
Or lead through Anarchy the way
To dungeons and to graves;
Strong arms can work no great reform,
Mind, mind alone must quell the storm.
Awake! in moral manhood strong,
Endowed with mental might,
With warm persuasion on your tongue,
To plead the cause of Right;
Let reason, centre of the soul,
Your wild and wandering thoughts control,
And give them life and light;
That ye may hope at length to gain
That freedom ye have sought in vain.

O! God! the future yet shall see,
On this fair world of thine,
The myriads wise, and good, and free,
Fulfil thy best design;
The dawn of Truth, long overcast,
Shall kindle into day at last;
Bright, boundless, and divine;
And man shall walk the hallow'd sod,
A being worthy of his God!

From the Dublin University Magazine.

BIRDS.

BY MRS. JAMES GRAY.

Joyous and happy creatures—
Romers of earth and air—
Free children of the woods—
Bright glancers o'er the floods,
Your homes are everywhere;
Dear are ye, and familiar to the heart,
Making of nature's loveliest things a part.
Ye are upon the mountains,
With proud and lonely flight;
Ye are upon the heath,
The dear blue heaven beneath,
Singing in wild delight;

The rock doth shelter you, and many a nest,
Amidst the ledges by the lake, doth rest.
Ye shin in the restless ocean,
White-poled, like fairy things :
Ye haunt the inland river,
And the sweeping willow quiver;

With the rustle of your wings;
Through the dark pineèd your homeward way ye take,
Or drop to your lone nests in bush and brake.

To you morn bringeth gladness—
The first red flush of day,
Breaking your rest, appeals
Unto your hearts—unseen—
The silent songs, that lay

Like dreams, within you through the quiet night,
And now burst freshly forth to hail the light.

You slumber with the sunset—
Scarce doth the day wax dim—
Scarce doth the first star glister,
When from your nests you twitter;

Your happy vesper hymn;
Like one who, to the woods her lone way winging
Fills the deep night with her impassioned singing !

Solemn are woods at midnight,
When through the heavy shade,
Scarce a moonbeam finds
An entrance where the winds

Stir through each green arcade,
But dear to you that safest solitude,
Where on your rest no mortal may intrude.

And joyful is your waking,
Amidst the sighing trees,
In the sweet matin hours,
When smile the opening flowers:

What ye more than these ?
Ye seek no praise—your songs as sweetly sound,
As though a crowd of worshippers stood round.

Ye are the poet's emblem,
So doth his song gush free—
So winged and glad his spirit,
Doth his high gift inherit,

Pouring its melody,
Beneath clear skies, and if they darken, keeping
Song ever in his heart, though it be sleeping.

Sleeping, but not forever,
Still to new life it doth waken,
When hope's sweet light doth waken,
And care and fear are shaken,

Like dew-drops from his wings ;
And 'midst the flowers and trees with sunshiny glisten,

He hath his own reward, though none be listening.

From the Oph.

A THOUGHT OVER A CRADLE.

BY N. P. WILLIS.

Iadden when thou smilest to my smile,
Child of my love ! I tremble to believe
That o'er the mirror of thy eye of blue,
The shadow of my heart will always pass.—

A heart that, from its struggle with the world,
Comes rightly to thy guarded cradle home,
And, careless of the staining dust it brings,
Asks for its idol ! Strange, that flowers of earth

Are visited by every air that stirs,
And drink in sweeteness only, while the child

That slumbers with its breast a blemish for heaven,
May take a blemish from the breath of love,
And bear the blight for ever.

I have wept
With gladness at the gift of this fair child !
My life is bound up in her ! But, O God !
Thou knowest how heavily my heart at times

Bears its sweet burden ; and if Thou has given

To nurture such a thine spotless flower,

To bring it up until unto Thee,

Take Thou the love, I pray Thee ! Give it light,

Though, following the sun, it turns from me !

But, by the chord thus wrung, and by the light

Shining about, draw me to my child,

And link us close, O God, when near to heaven !

REFORMATORY.

From the Christian Investigator.

Syracuse Convention.

The long-anticipated Convention at Syracuse has been held, and fully meets, on the whole, the expectations we had indulged respecting it. More than one hundred members entitled their names. The travelling was very bad. Had there been good sleighing, the number would probably have been much larger. The audience in attendance was good, notwithstanding the special meetings appointed in most of the churches in Syracuse on Wednesday evening. The best spirit prevailed. In all the discussions, no one intimated a doubt that the time for secession had fully come. No one doubted that Christian institutions should be honored. No one offered any apology for existing sectarian schisms, or questioned the propriety of sharing church privileges in common with all Christians. None denied that local church independence should be maintained. If contrary views existed, they were not expressed. The aid extended to the "Christian Investigator" encourages the editor to make arrangements for publishing another volume, for 1844. The "Declaration" was adopted in full Convention, with few dissenting votes; and those (so far as known) withheld only on two specific points, on which the proposed amendments of Gerrit Smith and President Green did not prevail. We regret that the conscientious convictions of those dear brethren, on those points, should have obliged them to withhold their names from the entire document; but so it was, and we honor their fidelity. When the infancy of our enterprise, and the personal investigation and independence of those engaged in it, are considered, it is wonderful that so good a degree of unanimity has been reached. We rejoice, most of all, that you exemplify the doctrine you teach, by following the example of your Divine Master, who identified himself with the poor, and went about doing good, when he had no where to lay his head.

But we rejoice, most of all, that you exemplify the doctrine you teach, by following the example of your Divine Master, who identified himself with the poor, and went about doing good, when he had no where to lay his head.

Go on, then, dear brother. God speed you in your enterprise. Though bonds and afflictions abide you, be not moved by them.

Being engaged in an enterprise similar to yours, we cannot close this communication without asking your prayers, and the prayers of those who act with you, for our success. We have not, it is true, a church establishment, and we are closely allied to the State, both in their temper, and the objects for which they labor. Both the State and the Church have "opposed" broad upon them. We labor for a class of men who are plunged in a tenfold greater depth of degradation and misery than are the operations of Great Britain. We need not, then, ask for your sympathy. We shall have it without. But we will ask that you should aid us what you are able, by teaching those with whom you labor, that they emigrate to this country, to help us to remember those who are in bonds, as bound with them.

We shall transmit, with this letter, a document containing a Declaration of the reasons which lead us to secede from the religious societies to which we have formerly belonged. From this, you will be able to learn, more definitely, what we are doing, and the reasons of our action. Accept our best wishes for your welfare.

By order of the Christian Convention, held at Syracuse, in the State of New-York, Dec. 20th and 21st,

WM. L. CHAPLIN, President.

JOHN MOSHER, Secretary.

Ezra Stiles, Secretary.

MISCELLANY.

From the N. Y. Tribune.

National Morality.

In a country where repudiation excites no blush, and adroit peculation is no bar to subsequent popularity and official honors, we cannot reasonably expect any elevated or rigorous standard of national morals. A recent ascent on the floor of the House of Representatives, however, struck us rather out of the common course, and we have waited several days to see whether it would be made the theme of public comment. So far, no remark upon it has met our eye, and we may as well give place to the reflections which its contemplation has excited.

Mr. John Q. Adams, it appears, had said something in rebuke of the passion for "licking out threatenings and slaughter" which is so prevalent on that floor, especially among the more raw and wind-pow'd portion of the "collective wisdom." In the course of his remarks, he alluded particularly to the very rampant propensity to "lick the British," which is well nigh a disease with a large portion of our "free and independent" sovereigns, and therefore a staple ingredient in all Congressional effervesences "for Buncombe." Hereupon, the report proceeds, Mr. Charles J. Ingolds (and who but he?) tartly interposed—

"Would not the gentleman declare war if England were to get possession of Cuba?"

"No," responded Mr. Adams.

"I would," said Mr. Ingolds, and the remark was hailed with eager approbation by (it is the *Herald*) we believe, styles them the *Democratic* members.

Let us look now, at the morality of this bravado, testing it by a "partial passage."

Mexico was lately the unquestioned owner of Texas; for the claimants raised to that region had been expressly surrendered by us, after thorough discussion, by the treaty of 1819. Some of our people, however, still consider it a territory of Mexico, but soon threw off allegiance to Mexico, and by violence declared their independence, which they have practically maintained. Now, suppose it were for our interest to obtain this territory, and should we see fit to pay Mexico a fair price for her, and should we set up to Mexico a fair colony here, and she should think proper to accept it, and to do their duties, which spring from its Divine organization.

3d. Resolved, That notwithstanding Christians have the power either to vote persons into or out of the Church of Christ, they have no right to interfere with the power and the right to command, subdue, and rebuke each other, and the power and the right, so far as exercised under the directions of an unbiased and charitable judgment, to extend or withdraw the hand of Christian fellowship.—*Negatived.*

4th. Resolved, That the history of Jesus Christ is that of a moral reformer; and, therefore, that Church, which shrinks from exposing moral reforms, is neither imbued with His spirit nor entitled to his name.—*Adopted.*

5th. Resolved, That to refuse to worship with a Church, because it is sectarian, or pro-slavery, or otherwise sinful, rather than because it does not wear the features, nor exhibit the character, nor perform the office, nor deserve the name, of a Church of Christ, is to guilty of schism, and of doing violence to that mystical body of which the Saviour is the Head, and His friends the members.—*Adopted.*

6th. Resolved, That the right to preach the gospel springs solely from the ability to preach it; and that this ability, however highly honored it may be, even though with a Cardinal's hat or a Pope's tiara, is well nigh a disease with a large portion of our "free and independent" sovereigns, and therefore a staple ingredient in all Congressional effervesces "for Buncombe." Hereupon, the report proceeds, Mr. Charles J. Ingolds (and who but he?) tartly interposed—

"Would not the gentleman declare war if England were to get possession of Cuba?"

"No," responded Mr. Adams.

"I would," said Mr. Ingolds, and the remark was hailed with eager approbation by (it is the *Herald*) we believe, styles them the *Democratic* members.

Let us look now, at the morality of this bravado, testing it by a "partial passage."

Mexico was lately the unquestioned owner of Texas; for the claimants raised to that region had been expressly surrendered by us, after thorough discussion, by the treaty of 1819. Some of our people, however, still consider it a territory of Mexico, but soon threw off allegiance to Mexico, and by violence declared their independence, which they have practically maintained. Now, suppose it were for our interest to obtain this territory, and should we see fit to pay Mexico a fair price for her, and should we set up to Mexico a fair colony here, and she should think proper to accept it, and to do their duties, which spring from its Divine organization.

Well: look at the same principles involved in another case—only the Bull, and the other animal having changed places: Spain is a feeble and declining nation, in debt to Great Britain; the latter covets (we will suppose) Cuba to be ours. We will suppose Great Britain should attempt to impose a veto, saying, "You Yankee cannot have Cuba—it will disrupt our West India possessions, or circumscribe our trade, and shall not be—we will make war upon you if you do not desist!"—what an immeasurable storm of wrath, an indignation, and defiance to the death, should we not be sure to find boiling up in the yester bosom of M. Charles J. Ingolds and his appliers?

Well: look at the same principles involved in another case—only the Bull, and the other animal having changed places: Spain is a feeble and declining nation, in debt to Great Britain; the latter covets (we will suppose) Cuba to be ours. We will suppose Great Britain should attempt to impose a veto, saying, "You Yankee cannot have Cuba—it will disrupt our West India possessions, or circumscribe our trade, and shall not be—we will make war upon you if you do not desist!"—what an immeasurable storm of wrath, an indignation, and defiance to the death, should we not be sure to find boiling up in the yester bosom of M. Charles J. Ingolds and his appliers?

Well: what are we to do about it?

Yes, it is easy to go to war; but how is that to mend the matter? It generally proves a pretty fair summer's work for us to take Canada; how are we to get hold of Cuba?

The *Moro Castle* is rather stout, the island a great deal harder to overrun than Canada, and the British navy not badly overmatched by our Home Squadron! Under the protection of the batteries which guard the harbor of Havana, they would be lost in complete perfection. Then will be understood the great idea that there is implanted in every human being, a principle which constitutes him a member of the church of Christ, which must be developed in order that the building be fitly framed, perfected in harmony and beauty, and presented or yielded up to the Father, without spot or blemish. So shall the church and the world be moulded into the image of God, and the distinction lost in the likeness of Jesus.

From the N. Y. Journal of Commerce.

Message of Gov. Briggs of Massachusetts.

His excellency vindicates the exertions of the people of Massachusetts to restore the time when the public spirit was high, and the public virtue inalienable right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; as in conformity with the principles on which they have acted ever since the adoption of the Constitution. He then proceeds to illustrate, by an examination of the State's institutions, the political and civil equality of her people. He dwells with exultation on the happy consequences which have resulted from her liberal and enlightened policy, in the development of wealth and unexampled prosperity, and in the individual enlightenment and elevation of character which distinguish her citizens. He points with pride to her flourishing manufactures, her extended commerce, her successful agriculture. He rejoices in the facilities she affords for the education of her youth, and the million of money annually expended to rear them up in virtue and intelligence. He extols her benevolence, in the provisions she has established for relief of the infirmities of our nature, her institutions for the blind, her asylums for the insane, her Hospitals and Infirmarys.

The numerous rail-roads, extending from the metropolis to the remotest sections of the State, constitute lasting memorials of the enterprise of her citizens. And in this connexion his excellency states, that, by a direct interest in the works of internal improvement within her limits, and by lending her credit to others to complete those works, Massachusetts has incurred a debt amounting to a fraction over six millions of dollars. He declares emphatically her determination and ability to pay every dollar, and to do justice to those who have lent her money.

He recommends a reduction in the number of public offices; he suggests that the session of the Legislature should be restricted to the briefest period compatible with the despatch of public business; he disconcentuates the growing practice of discussing subjects which appropriately belong to the national Legislature in the assemblies of the States, as disturbing the harmony of local legislation, and involving delay and expense.

He intimates strong doubts of the constitutionality of the act of the last Legislature, reducing the salaries of the judges of the Supreme Judicial Court, below the amount at which they were established by law at the time when the judges were appointed and accepted of their office, and submits the matter to the grave and candid consideration of the Legislature.

CONFIDENCE IN GOODNESS. There is something very winning and endearing in Confidence. Who could tell a story of a bird that fled to his bosom from the pounce of the hawk? Or who could take advantage of having him in his hand to deprive the little trumpery of his liberty? Noting is ever lost by trusting in the ingenuous and noble-minded; they always feel a responsibility to re-pose the confidence reposed in them. What then, may we not expect from the God of all comfort?

From the Gospel Messenger.

BY MRS. S. R. MORRIS.

The church and the world is a very common truth, but one which is but imperfectly understood.

The church, in the popular acceptance of the term, is that portion of mankind who profess to have been regenerated, renewed by the Holy Spirit, who have acknowledged their assent to a creed, and that claim for themselves peculiar privileges, and who

claim an inheritance incorruptible,

undefiled, and that faith not away.

In most minds,

the purity, goodness, and self-sacrifice of

the church, are the chief characteristics.

Anti-Slavery Melodies,

Kiss for a Blow,

Ten Years of Experience, &c. &c.

Such are the claims of the